

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 10, 2009. Claims 24-32 are presented for examination, of which Claims 24, 27 and 30 are in independent form. Claims 24, 27 and 30-32 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 24-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,361,332 (Yoshida et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0002063 (Oomura et al.).

Applicant submits that the independent claims, together with their dependent claims, are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The nature of the present invention and the references have been adequately discussed in previous papers, and it is not believed necessary to repeat that discussion in full.

Claim 24 recites, among other features, “a display unit configured to display a selection window for accepting a user selection of a code system from the list of the code systems obtained by the first obtainment unit [code systems supported by the printer] when the determination unit determines that the code system obtained by the second obtainment unit [designated code system] is not included in the list of code systems.”

Applicant notes, specifically, that *Yoshida* differs from the apparatus of Claim 24 in at least two regards. First, Applicants point out that the word “font”, in the present application, refers to the relationship between a character encoding (or coding scheme, code system, etc.) and a glyph set (para. [0002], for example). However, the word “font”, as used in *Yoshida*, clearly refers exclusively to a glyph set format, such as an “output font” and a “bitmap font” (see col. 8, lines 61-63 and Fig. 4. for example). No teaching or suggestion can be found in

Yoshida regarding "fonts" in any other sense of the word, and in particular, nothing in *Yoshida* is seen to relate in any way to "fonts" as the word is used in the present application.

Second, further according to the mentioned aspects of the present invention, when a requested font is not supported by a printer, a user is allowed to select a font from a list of fonts that are supported by the printer, and which thus are different from the requested font (para. [0033]-[0035]). However, in *Yoshida*, when a requested glyph set format is missing from a first device, namely a workstation or a printer, an internal retrieval table containing information regarding "font" managers and "fonts" (namely glyph set formats) for each device is used without displaying anything to allow a user to make any selection (see Fig. 4 and col. 12, lines 3-11, for example). Furthermore, the retrieval table is used to select a second device which has the requested glyph set format or at least an appropriate "font" manager, not to select a glyph set format that is available on the first device and different from the requested glyph set format (see col. 11, line 63-col. 12, line 2, for example).

The Office Action states that "the display unit is in fact taught by *Yoshida*... where the retrieval table is shown for a selection to be make [sic]." As discussed above, however, *Yoshida* does not appear to present the retrieval table or any information regarding the first device to a user, but uses the retrieval table internally to find out what is available on the second device. Therefore, even if *Yoshida* discussed "coding systems," as recited in Claim 24, it does not disclose the display unit of Claim 24.

The Office Action also states that "the fact that *Yoshida* teaches font managers containing the supported font schemes [which Applicant takes to mean glyph set formats] does not exclude the reference from teaching coding systems." As discussed above, however, *Yoshida*'s disclosure relating to "fonts" clearly concerns only glyph set formats. On the other

hand, *Oomura* involves “fonts” meaning only relationships between a character encoding (or coding scheme, code system, etc.) and a glyph set. Therefore, even if *Yoshida* disclosed the display unit except for “coding systems,” as recited in Claim 24, no motivation exists for combining *Yoshida* with *Oomura*.

Accordingly, Claim 24 is believed patentable over *Yoshida* and *Oomura*, considered separately or in any permissible combination.

Independent Claims 27 and 30 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 24 and, therefore, are also believed to be patentable over the *Yoshida* and *Oomura* for the reasons discussed above.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant’s opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims. Therefore, the independent claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and its entry is therefore believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. In any event, however, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner

believe that issues remain outstanding, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 4294943_1